

REMARKS

Claims 35-44 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-34 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. No claims stand rejected. New claims 35-44 have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the new claims may be found at, for example, paragraphs [0075] through [0077] of the published application.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants request that the Examiner consider the patent to Kelly (6,306,035), submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement of October 27, 2005. Applicants' representative does not see an indication in the file history of this reference being considered.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope, Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations herein are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Interview Summary

A telephone interview was held on October 28, 2009 to discuss the restriction requirement of 9/22/2009. Examiners David Duffy and Corbett Coburn and Applicants' representatives Roger Sampson and Ernest Ellenberger were present in the telephone interview. Applicants' representatives argued that the new features added to claim 1 in the amendment filed on 8/4/09 are not independent or distinct from the originally-claimed features, because the new features are related to the originally-claimed system for managing a progressive jackpot. For example, the new features of comparing an untrusted winning outcome generated by the second gaming system to a trusted outcome generated by the progressive engine in accordance with a game model, are part of the progressive engine's features for incorporating multiple gaming systems into a progressive game so that the multiple gaming systems can operate together in the

same progressive game. Examiner Duffy agreed not to issue a first-action final rejection in response to Applicants' next submission. No further agreement was reached.

Restriction Requirement

Claims 1-8 and 30-34 have been withdrawn by the Examiner as allegedly being directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed. The Examiner suggests that the previous claims filed 12/16/2008 were directed to a system for maintaining parity between gaming systems in a progressive network, which would be classified in 463/27, and the newly submitted claims 1-8 and 30-34, filed 8/4/09, are directed to a system which verifies prize generation of a third party gaming system by independent generation of outcomes, which would be classified in 463/29.

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement and request that the Examiner reconsider in light of the arguments presented herein. Claim 1, as amended on 8/4/09, included both existing features filed on 12/16/2008 and new features added in that amendment. Applicants respectfully submit that the new features are directly related to the existing features, the restriction requirement should be withdrawn, and claim 1 should be examined.

The new features are directly related to the existing features because both are directed to, and are features of, a system that manages a progressive jackpot and harmonizes information used across multiple different game systems to enable the game systems to participate in a shared progressive game. The existing features of claim 1 involve harmonizing progressive payment parameters, such as game odds and minimum wagers between two gaming systems that have different parameter values to allow both systems to participate in the progressive game.

The new features of claim 1 extend the harmonization to enable gaming systems that are owned or operated by different organizations to participate in the progressive game when one of the organizations does not necessarily trust the other. The new features involve harmonizing win/loss results produced by a first game system with a progressive game provided by a second game system that does not "trust" the win/loss results generated and submitted to the progressive game by the first game system.

This harmonization is accomplished, in one example, by transmitting a random number that the second game system used to produce a win/loss result from the second game system to the first game system. The first game system then uses the same rules, i.e., game model, as the second game system to independently generate a win/loss result starting from the random number received from the second game. The first game can thus verify that the second game produced the correct win/loss result, and include the win/loss result in the progressive game.

Verification of win/loss results is important in wide-area, multi-national progressive games such as those described in Applicants' specification. Game systems provided by third parties are not necessarily trusted by the operator of a progressive game, but the operator may still wish to include the third-party's game system in the progressive game. Therefore, it is desirable to be able to provide verification of the third party game system's win/loss results. The newly submitted features of claim 1 relate to providing such a trusted game system without having to trust, reveal or audit a third party's game system program source code, which is an alternate way of establishing a trusted relationship between game systems. Instead, the third party's game model, i.e., the rules by which the third-party determines win-loss results starting from random numbers, is provided to the progressive game operator. Providing these rules ordinarily involves significantly less time and effort than would be required to audit the third party's game system program source code. *See Applicants' specification, paragraphs [0032] and [0033].*

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that because both the existing and new features of claim 1 are directed to, and are features of, a system that manages a progressive jackpot and harmonizes information used across multiple different game systems to enable such game systems to participate in a shared progressive game, the new features are directly related to the existing features of claim 1, and the restriction requirement should be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the art relied upon describes or suggests a progressive game management device as recited in claim 44. For example, none of the cited art describes or suggests progressive management logic configured to initiate at least one transmission to at least one potential client system, wherein the at least one transmission solicits participation of the at least one potential client system in the progressive game, as is recited in claim 44. Further, none of the cited art describes or suggests logic configured to receive at least one request from at least one gaming system to participate in the progressive game, wherein the at least one request includes information describing characteristics of the gaming system seeking participation, including progressive payout parameters. Still further, none of the cited art describes or suggests logic configured to register the at least one gaming system for participation in the progressive game in response to a request to activate a new game to link to a progressive award. Hence, new claim 44, and new claim 45, which depends from claim 44, are patentable over the cited references.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing this Response to Restriction Requirement, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 504480 (Order No. IGT1P395).

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
/Ernest L. Ellenberger/
Ernest L. Ellenberger
Registration No. 56,529

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
/Roger S. Sampson/
Roger S. Sampson
Registration No. 44,314